

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

. |

AIMEE MORRISON,

Case No. 2:21-cv-00667-APG-EJY

ORDER

Plaintiff,

v.

JOE BRANCATO; OSWEGO COUNTY,

Defendants.

Pending before the Court are pro se Plaintiff's Motions for Relief (ECF Nos. 15, 19, 34). Defendants filed a Response to each Motion (ECF Nos. 22, 25, 43, respectively) contending that the Motions should be denied because Plaintiff failed to meet procedural requirements for filing Motions before this Court.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7(b)(2), any motion seeking relief from the Court must: "(A) be in writing unless made during a hearing or trial; (B) state with particularity the grounds for seeking the order; and (C) state the relief sought." Nevada Local Rule 7-2 further requires that all motions "must be supported by a memorandum of points and authorities." Under LR 7-2(d), "the failure of a moving party to file points and authorities in support of a motion constitutes a consent to the denial of the motion."

Plaintiff's Motions are procedurally deficient under Federal and Local Rules. The allegations contained therein are difficult to understand and contain largely unintelligible statements concerning Defendant Joe Brancato and various other individuals not named as defendants in this action. The Motions do not contain memorandums of points and authorities and fail to state in any intelligible manner what relief, if any, Plaintiff seeks. After careful review of Plaintiff's Motions, the Court finds that she does not seek any relief that the Court could grant. Therefore, the Court denies Plaintiff's Motions.

Plaintiff has also filed numerous "Notices" that contain similar, largely unintelligible, statements. See ECF Nos. 14, 16, 21, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46. Court filings are

generally limited to complaints, responses to complaints, requests for injunctive relief, dispositive motions, replies, and status reports or other informational documents if there is an order from the Court asking for such information. Plaintiff's repeated Notice of Motion filings are inappropriate and unnecessary. Plaintiff is advised to cease filing these documents absent an order from the Court to do so. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motions for Relief (ECF Nos. 15, 19, 34) are **DENIED**. Dated this 27th day of July, 2021. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Plaintiff has been twice advised by the Court concerning the requirements to file or defend against dispositive

7, 9.

motions like motions to dismiss, motions for judgment on the pleadings, and motions for summary judgment. ECF Nos.